## John P. Bostany

John P. Bostany [john@bozlaw.com] From:

Sent: Friday, September 14, 2007 5:41 PM

To: 'Marvin Bartel' Subject: RE: GMA/ Eminent

## Marvin

That is NOT acceptable. We believe that CHARLOTTE RONSON, like CHARLOTTE SOLNICKI, is a mark substantially indistinguishable from CHARLOTTE and is an infringing use. The injunction therefore cannot contain a section permitting you to use CHARLOTTE RONSON.

I await your advices.

**JPB** 

From: Marvin Bartel [mailto:mbartel@bartelevans.com]

Sent: Friday, September 14, 2007 5:39 PM

To: john@bozlaw.com **Subject:** GMA/ Eminent

John,

As you know already from our conversation, the language is not acceptable as it arguably would bar my client from selling products in the future with the Charlotte Ronson mark. My client would agree to cease selling Charlotte Solnicki products.

I will double check with my client but if f we were to agree to any injunction I believe it would have to carve out Charlotte Ronson and "Charlotte styles" used by certain companies.

I will get back to you later today or early next week.

MARVIN BARTEL Bartel & Evans LLP 4695 MacArthur Court, Suite 310 Newport Beach, CA 92660

Tel. No. 949.752.3700 / Fax No. 949.752.3701 Direct Dial: 949.752.3703 / Cell No. 949.228.5122 E-Mail Address: mbartel@bartelevans.com

From: John P. Bostany [mailto:john@bozlaw.com]

Sent: Friday, September 14, 2007 2:14 PM

To: Marvin Bartel Subject: Solnicki

Hi Marvin

Here is the consent injunction we spoke about Please let me know if this is acceptable before I contact my client Thanks

**JPB**